Attorney Docket No.: HAR-105

Serial No.: 09/922,532

Examiner Barbara P. Badio; Group Art Unit 1616

The Examiner also relies on Sorkin ('393), Maurel et al ('924) and Perez ('354) and that

Applicant's claims are rejected for obviousness in that Maurel teaches the utilization of plant

sterols. However, Applicant respectfully submits that even with the contention that Maurel

teaches the utilization of plant sterols, the combination of Sorkin, Maurel, and Perez does not

render obvious the mixture and methods claimed in the amended claims of the Applicant in that

the cited references neither singularly nor in their combination address the 1) unique composition

of the policosanol of Applicant's invention or 2) the unique composition incorporating the

policosanol.

In terms of the provisional double-patenting rejection, Applicant again respectfully

requests that a determination be made on the merits of the present invention, as well as on

09/772,790, after which Applicant will, if necessary, make a terminal disclaimer.

It is Applicant's belief that this application is in a condition for allowance. An action so

indicating is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that discussion of this application

would be beneficial, the undersigned may be contacted at the telephone numbers indicated

below.

November 14, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

Douil & Ruch

BAKER & McKENZIE 130 E. Randolph Drive Chicago, IL 60601

ph:

312 - 861 - 2851

fax:

312 - 861 - 8937

David I. Roche Reg. No. 30,797